arXiv:1502.02108v1 [math.AP] 7 Feb 2015

On the Brézis–Nirenberg problem with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

Yuanze Wu[a*] Tsung-fang Wu[b†] Zeng Liu[c‡]

[a] *College of Sciences, China University of Mining And Technology, Xuzhou 221116 P.R. China*

[b] *Department of Applied Mathematics, National University of Kaohsiung, Kaohsiung 811, Taiwan*

[c] *Department of Mathematics, Soochow University, Suzhou 215006, P.R. China*

Abstract: In this paper, we study the decomposition of Nehari manifold for the Brézis–Nirenberg problem with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. By using this result, the Lusternik–Schnirelman category and the minimax principle, we establish a multiple result (four solutions) for the Brézis–Nirenberg problem with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Keywords: Critical Sobolev exponent; Multiple solutions; Nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions.

AMS Subject Classification 2010: 35B38; 35J20; 35J25.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following elliptic problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda u + u^{2^*-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \mu g & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \qquad (\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N (N \geq 3)$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $2^* := 2N/(N-2)$ is the critical Sobolev exponent, $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$ are two parameters, $g(x) \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega) \cap C(\partial\Omega)$.

By the classical regularity theory (cf. Gilbarg and Trudinger [14]), each solution of Problem $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ is C^1, which implies that $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ has no solution if $\min\{g(x), 0\} \neq 0$ for $\mu > 0$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ with $\mu > 0$ and $g \equiv 0$ is equivalent to $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0})$. So, it is natural to discuss $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ under the following assumption on $g(x)$

(G) $g(x) \geq 0$ and $g(x) \not\equiv 0$.

$(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0})$ is called as the Brézis–Nirenberg problem, since it has been first studied by Brézis and Nirenberg in their nice paper [6]. In that paper, they have proved that $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0})$ has a solution for $N \geq 4$ if and only if $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, where λ_1 is the first eigenvalue of $(-\Delta, H_0^1(\Omega))$. They have also proved that there exists $\lambda^* \in (0, \lambda_1)$ such that $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0})$ has a solution for $N = 3$ when $\lambda \in (\lambda^*, \lambda_1)$ and no solution for $N = 3$ when $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$. Moreover, when Ω is a ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $\lambda^* = \frac{\lambda_1}{4}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0})$ had no solution for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*]$ (see also in [6]). Since then, many papers have been devoted to the Brézis–Nirenberg problem, see for example Arioli et al. [2], Clapp and Weth [12], Chen et al. [11], Schechter and Zou [20], Zhang [22] and the references therein.

When $\mu > 0$ and (G) hold, $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ is a kind of the so-called elliptic problems with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Since $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ links closed to $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0})$, the Brézis–Nirenberg

---

[*] Corresponding author. E-mail address: wuyz850306@cumt.edu.cn (Yuanze Wu)

[†] E-mail address: tfwu@nuk.edu.tw (Tsung-fang Wu)

[‡] E-mail address: luckliu@163.com (Zeng Liu)

problem, we call $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ as the Brézis–Nirenberg problem with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions.

The elliptic problems with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions have been studied widely in the past decade. To our best knowledge, many papers have been devoted to the existence of infinitely many nontrivial solutions for subcritical cases, see for example Salvatore [18], Bolle et al. [5], Candela et al. [10], Hu [15] and the references therein, and there are few results about the critical case, for example $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to study the existence and multiplicity of solutions for the elliptic problems with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions and critical Sobolev exponent. More precisely, the solutions for $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$.

It is well known that if v is a solution of the following elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v = \lambda(v+\mu\varphi) + (v+\mu\varphi)^{2^*-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{$\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu}$}$$

then $u = v + \varphi$ is a solution of $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$, where φ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\varphi = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad \varphi = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and vice versa by the maximum principle. Therefore, the study of the existence and multiplicity of solutions for $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ is equivalent to the study of the existence and multiplicity of solutions for $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$.

Clearly, $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ has a variational structure in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the corresponding functional of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$, defined on $H_0^1(\Omega)$, is given by

$$I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2 dx - \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega |v+\mu\varphi|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |v+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} dx.$$

Hence, we can use the variational method to study the existence and multiplicity of solutions for $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$.

The Nehari manifold is a useful tool in proving the existence and multiplicity of solutions for elliptic problems with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions and variational structure (cf. Sun and Li [19] and Wu [21]). Let $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu} := \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : I'_{\lambda,\mu}(u)u = 0\}$ be the Nehari manifold of $I_{\lambda,\mu}$. It is well known that the Nehari manifold $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$ is closely linked to the behavior of the fibering maps, which is given by $T_{\lambda,\mu,u}(t) := I_{\lambda,\mu}(tu)$, $t > 0$. The fibering map has been introduced by Drábek and Pohozaev in [13] and has also been studied by Brown and Wu [7], Brown and Zhang [8]. Moreover, $T'_{\lambda,\mu,u}(t) = 0$ is equivalent to $tu \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$. In particular, $T'_{\lambda,\mu,u}(1) = 0$ if and only if $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$. Since $T_{\lambda,\mu,u} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R})$ for every $0 \neq u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, it is natural to split the Nehari manifold $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$ into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu} :=& \{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu} : T''_{\lambda,\mu,u}(1) > 0\}; \\ \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu} :=& \{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu} : T''_{\lambda,\mu,u}(1) < 0\}; \\ \mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,\mu} :=& \{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu} : T''_{\lambda,\mu,u}(1) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The crucial point of using the method of the fibering maps (or the tool of the Nehari manifold) is to show that the unit sphere of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is homeomorphous to $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. However, when $\mu > 0$, $|u+\mu\varphi|^{2^*}$ can not be controlled by some homogeneous terms of $|u|$. This brings about the usual arguments of proving the homeomorphism between the unit sphere of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ are invalid in dealing with $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ for $\mu > 0$. Another difference in using the method of the fibering maps to find solutions of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ with $\mu > 0$ is that even though $v_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a minimizer of $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$ on $\mathcal{N}^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}$, it is not trivial to know $|v_{\lambda,\mu}|$ is also a minimizer of $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$ on $\mathcal{N}^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}$. In order to prove the multiplicity of solutions (more precisely, four solutions) for $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ by using the method of fibering maps, we need to overcome these difficulties, which require us to make some careful analysis and complicated estimates.

The first result obtained in this paper is

Theorem 1.1 *Assume* (G) *holds and* $N \geq 4$. *Then we have the following.*

- (a) $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ *has no solution for* $\lambda \in [\lambda_1, +\infty)$ *and* $\mu \geq 0$.
- (b) *For every* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, *there exist* $0 < \mu_\lambda^* \leq \mu^*(\lambda) < +\infty$ *such that* $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ *has two solutions for* $\mu \in (0, \mu_\lambda^*)$, *one solution for* $\mu \in [\mu_\lambda^*, \mu^*(\lambda)]$ *and no solutions for* $\mu > \mu^*(\lambda)$.

It is well know that the number of solutions for elliptic problems on bounded domains are effected by the topology of the domain, see for example He and Yang [16] and Wu [21]. Inspired by these papers, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.2 *Assume* (G) *holds and* $N \geq 4$. *If the domain* Ω *satisfies*

- (D) *There exists* $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ *such that* $\overline{B}_{\frac{1}{\delta_0}} \backslash B_{\delta_0} \subset \Omega$ *and* $B_{\frac{\delta_0}{2}} \cap \Omega = \emptyset$, *where* $B_r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| < r\}$.

Then there exist $\lambda_* \in (0, \lambda_1)$ *and* $\mu_* > 0$ *such that* $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ *has at least three solutions for* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ *and* $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$. *Furthermore, if* δ_0 *is small enough, then* $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,\mu})$ *has at least four solutions for* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ *and* $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$.

In this paper, we will always denote the usual norm in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_p$, respectively. C will be indiscriminately used to denote various positive constants.

2 Nonexistence results for $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$

In this section, we will discuss the nonexistence results for $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$. For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, we consider an operator which is defined on $H_0^1(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R}$ as follows

$$\mathcal{H}_\lambda(v, \mu) = -\Delta v - \lambda(v + \mu\varphi) - (v + \mu\varphi)^{2^*-1}.$$

It is clearly that $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(0,0) = 0$ and $\frac{d\mathcal{H}_\lambda}{dv}(0,0) = id - \lambda\mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the imbedding map from $H_0^1(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$. Since $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, by the implicit function theorem, there exist $\mu^0(\lambda) > 0$ and a continuous curve (v_μ, μ) in $H_0^1(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R}$ with $v_0 = 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(v_\mu, \mu) = 0$ for all $0 \leq \mu \leq \mu^0(\lambda)$. For every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, let

$$\mu^*(\lambda) := \sup\{\mu : \mu > 0 \text{ and } (\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu}) \text{ has a solution}\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that $\mu^*(\lambda) \geq \mu^0(\lambda) > 0$. The next lemma implies $\mu^*(\lambda) < +\infty$ for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$.

Lemma 2.1 *Assume* (G) *holds. Then* $\mu^*(\lambda) < +\infty$ *for every* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$.

Proof. Assuming the contrary. Then there exists $\lambda_0 \in (0, \lambda_1)$ such that $\mu^*(\lambda_0) = +\infty$. This means that there exists $\{\mu_n\}$ satisfying $\mu_n \to +\infty$ as $n \to +\infty$ such that $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_0,\mu_n})$ has a solution u_{μ_n} for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since u_{μ_n} is a solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_0,\mu_n})$, multiplying e_1, the eigenfunction of λ_1, on $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda_0,\mu_n})$ with both sides and integrate, we obtain

$$(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)\int_\Omega u_{\mu_n} e_1 dx \geq \lambda_0 \mu_n \int_\Omega \varphi e_1 dx + \int_{\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0,n}} u_{\mu_n}^{2^*-1} e_1 dx,$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0,n} := \{x \in \Omega : u_{\mu_n} > (\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}\}$. On the other hand,

$$(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)\int_\Omega u_{\mu_n} e_1 dx \leq (\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)\int_{\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0,n}} u_{\mu_n} e_1 dx + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)^{\frac{2^*-1}{2^*-2}} \int_\Omega e_1 dx.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0,n}} ((\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)u_{\mu_n} - u_{\mu_n}^{2^*-1}) e_1 dx + \int_\Omega (\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)^{\frac{2^*-1}{2^*-2}} e_1 dx - \lambda_0 \mu_n \int_\Omega \varphi e_1 dx \geq 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Note that $\int_{\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0,n}} \big((\lambda_1-\lambda)u_{\mu_n}-u_{\mu_n}^{2^*-1}\big)e_1dx<0$. Thus (2.1) is impossible for n large enough, since $\int_\Omega \varphi e_1dx>0$ by (G) and the maximum principle. ▮

We close this section by the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1 *Assume (G) holds. Then*

(1) *$(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ has no solution for $\lambda\in[\lambda_1,+\infty)$ and $\mu\geq 0$.*

(2) *For every $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_1)$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ has one solution for $\mu\in(0,\mu^*(\lambda)]$ and no solutions for $\mu>\mu^*(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Multiplying e_1 on $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ with both sides and integrate, it is easy to see that the conclusion (1) holds since $\varphi\geq 0$ under (G) by the maximum principle. For every $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_1)$, by the definition of $\mu^*(\lambda)$, we can use the method of sub- and supper-solutions (cf. Cañada et al. [9]) in a standard way to show that $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ has a solution for every $\mu\in(0,\mu^*(\lambda))$. By taking a limit, $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ also has a solution for $\mu=\mu(\lambda)^*$. Thus, conclusion (2) follows immediately from Lemma 2.1. ▮

3 Properties of the Nehari manifold

In this section, we will study the decomposition and properties of the Nehari manifold $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$ and the fibering map $T_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t)$. We start by

Lemma 3.1 *For every $0<\lambda<\lambda_1$, there exists $\mu_\lambda^0>0$ such that, for every $\mu\in(0,\mu_\lambda^0)$, we have*

(1) *If $v\neq 0$ and $\lambda\mu\int_\Omega\varphi vdx+\mu^{2^*-1}\int_\Omega\varphi^{2^*-1}vdx\leq 0$ then there exists unique $t_{\lambda,\mu}^-(v)>0$ such that $t_{\lambda,\mu}^-(v)v\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^-$.*

(2) *If $v\neq 0$ and $\lambda\mu\int_\Omega\varphi vdx+\mu^{2^*-1}\int_\Omega\varphi^{2^*-1}vdx>0$ then there exists unique $t_{\lambda,\mu}^-(v)>t_{\lambda,\mu}^+(v)>0$ such that $t_{\lambda,\mu}^+(v)v\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^+$ and $t_{\lambda,\mu}^-(v)v\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^-$. Moreover, $I_{\lambda,\mu}(t_{\lambda,\mu}^+(v)v)=\min_{0\leq t\leq t_{\lambda,\mu}^-(v)}I_{\lambda,\mu}(tv)$.*

(3) *$\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^0=\emptyset$.*

(4) *$dist(\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^-,\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^+):=\inf\{\|v-z\|:v\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^-,z\in\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^+\}>C(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}>0$.*

Proof. Clearly, for every $0\neq v\in H_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t)=t\|v\|^2-\lambda\int_\Omega(tv+\mu\varphi)vdx-\int_\Omega|tv+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(tv+\mu\varphi)vdx$$

and

$$T''_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t)=\|v\|^2-\lambda\|v\|_2^2-(2^*-1)\int_\Omega|tv+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}v^2dx.$$

Since $\lambda<\lambda_1$, there exists $\mu_\lambda^1>0$ such that $(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})S-(2^*-1)2^{2^*-2}\mu^{2^*-2}\|\varphi\|_{2^*}^{2^*}>0$ for $\mu\in(0,\mu_\lambda^1)$, where S is the best Sobolev embedding constant given by $S=\inf_{u\in H_0^1(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}}\frac{\|u\|^2}{\|u\|_{2^*}^2}$. Let

$$t_0(v)=\Big(\frac{\|v\|^2-\lambda\|v\|_2^2-(2^*-1)2^{2^*-2}\mu^{2^*-2}\int_\Omega|\varphi|^{2^*-2}v^2dx}{(2^*-1)2^{2^*-2}\|v\|_{2^*}^{2^*}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}},$$

then $T''_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t)>0$ for $t\in(0,t_0(v))$. For the sake of clarity, we divide the following proof into several claims.

Claim 1: For every $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_1)$, there exists $\mu_\lambda^2\in(0,\mu_\lambda^1)$ such that $T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t_0(v))>0$ for $\mu\in(0,\mu_\lambda^2)$.

Indeed, if $\lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx + \mu^{2^*-1}\int_\Omega \varphi^{2^*-1} v dx \leq 0$, then $T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(0) \geq 0$. Since $T''_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t) > 0$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$, $\mu \in (0,\mu^1_\lambda)$ and $t \in (0, t_0(v))$, $T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t_0(v)) > 0$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^1_\lambda)$. On the other hand, if $\lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx + \mu^{2^*-1}\int_\Omega \varphi^{2^*-1} v dx > 0$, then $T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(0) < 0$. In this case, by directly calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t_0(v)) = & t_0(v)(\|v\|^2 - \lambda\|v\|_2^2) - \lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx - \int_\Omega |t_0(v)v + \mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(t_0(v)v + \mu\varphi) v dx \\
\geq & t_0(v)(\|v\|^2 - \lambda\|v\|_2^2) - \lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx - 2^{2^*-2}(t_0(v)^{2^*-1}\|v\|_{2^*}^{2^*} + \int_\Omega |v||\mu\varphi|^{2^*-1} dx) \\
\geq & t_0(v)(1 - \frac{1}{2^*-1})(\|v\|^2 - \lambda\|v\|_2^2) - \lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx - 2^{2^*-2}\int_\Omega |v||\mu\varphi|^{2^*-1} dx \\
\geq & (C(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1} - C_1\mu^{2^*-2})^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu^{2^*-1} - C_1\lambda\mu)\|v\|_{2^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$, there exists $\mu^2_\lambda \in (0,\mu^1_\lambda)$ such that $T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t_0(v)) > 0$ for $\mu \in (0,\mu^2_\lambda)$.

Claim 2: For every $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$, there exists $\mu^3_\lambda \in (0,\mu^2_\lambda)$ such that if $t \geq t_0(v)$, $\mu \in (0,\mu^3_\lambda)$ and $T'_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t) = 0$ then $T''_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t) < 0$.

In fact, if not, then there exist λ_0 and a sequence $\mu_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that $T'_{\lambda_0,\mu_n,v}(t_n(v)) = 0$ and $T''_{\lambda_0,\mu_n,v}(t_n(v)) \geq 0$ for some $t_n(v) \geq t_0(v)$. This, together with the Young inequality, implies

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \geq & (2^*-1)t_n(v)^2\int_\Omega |t_n(v)v + \mu_n\varphi|^{2^*-2} v^2 dx - \lambda_0\mu_n t_n(v)\int_\Omega \varphi v dx \\
& - \int_\Omega |t_n(v)v + \mu_n\varphi|^{2^*-2}(t_n(v)^2 v + t_n(v)\mu_n\varphi) v dx \\
\geq & (2^*-2)t_n(v)^2\int_\Omega |t_n(v)v + \mu_n\varphi|^{2^*-2} v^2 dx - \lambda_0\mu_n t_n(v)\int_\Omega \varphi v dx \\
& - \int_\Omega |t_n(v)v + \mu_n\varphi|^{2^*-2} t_n(v)\mu_n\varphi v dx \\
\geq & C t_n(v)^{2^*}\|v\|_{2^*}^{2^*} - t_n(v)C_1\lambda_0\mu_n\|v\|_{2^*} - C_1\mu_n t_n(v)^{2^*-1}\|v\|_{2^*}^{2^*-1} - C_1\mu_n^{2^*-2} t_n(v)^2\|v\|_{2^*}^2 \\
& - C_1\mu_n^{2^*-1} t_n(v)\|v\|_{2^*} \\
\geq & C t_n(v)^{2^*}\|v\|_{2^*}^{2^*} - C_1\mu_n^{2^*} - C_1(\lambda_0\mu_n)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Since $t_n(v) \geq t_0(v)$, $(t_n(v)\|v\|_{2^*})^{2^*} \geq C((1 - \frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu_n^{2^*-2})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-2}}$, which implies

$$0 \geq C((1 - \frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu_n^{2^*-2})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-2}} - C_1\mu_n^{2^*} - C_1(\lambda_0\mu_n)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-1}} = C(1 - \frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_1} + o_n(1))^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-2}} + o_n(1),$$

which is a contradiction for n large enough since $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1$.

Claim 3 $T'_{\lambda,\mu}(t) \to -\infty$ as $t \to +\infty$ for every $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$.

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
T'_{\lambda,\mu}(t) = & t(\|v\| - \lambda\|v\|_2^2) - \lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx - \int_\Omega |tv + \mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(tv + \mu\varphi) v dx \\
= & t(\|v\| - \lambda\|v\|_2^2) - \lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx - t^{2^*-1}(\int_\Omega |v|^{2^*} dx + o_t(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $v \neq 0$, $T'_{\lambda,\mu}(t) \to -\infty$ as $t \to +\infty$.

By Claims 1 and 3, for every $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^2_\lambda)$, there exists $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v) > t_0(v)$ such that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ for every $v \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$. Thanks to Claim 2, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$ is uniqueness when $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^3_\lambda)$. Moreover, if $\lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi v dx + \mu^{2^*-1}\int_\Omega \varphi^{2^*-1} v dx > 0$, then by Claim 1, for every $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^2_\lambda)$, there exists unique $t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(v) \in (0, t_0(v))$ such that $t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $T_{\lambda,\mu}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(v)) = \min_{0 \leq t \leq t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)} T_{\lambda,\mu}(t)$. If there exist $\lambda_0 \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu_0 \in (0,\mu^3_{\lambda_0})$ such that

$\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda_0,\mu_0} \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $v_0 \in \mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda_0,\mu_0}$. This means that $T'_{\lambda_0,\mu_0,v_0}(1) = 0$ and $T''_{\lambda_0,\mu_0,v_0}(1) = 0$. By Claim 2, we have $1 < t_0(v_0)$. This, together with the choice of $t_0(v_0)$, implies $T''_{\lambda_0,\mu_0,v_0}(1) > 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,\mu} = \emptyset$ for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^3_\lambda)$. If there exist $\lambda_0 \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and a sequence $\mu_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda_0,\mu_n}, \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda_0,\mu_n}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then there exist $v_n \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda_0,\mu_n}$ and $z_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda_0,\mu_n}$ such that $\|v_n - z_n\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $v_n \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda_0,\mu_n}$, $T'_{\lambda_0,\mu_n,v_n}(1) = 0$ and $T''_{\lambda_0,\mu_n,v_n}(1) > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Similar to (3.1), we obtain

$$\|v_n\| < C\big((\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_0})((\lambda_0\mu_n)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-1}} + \mu_n^{2^*})\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.2}$$

On the other hand, since $z_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda_0,\mu_n}$, $T'_{\lambda_0,\mu_n,z_n}(1) = 0$ and $T''_{\lambda_0,\mu_n,z_n}(1) < 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies $1 > t_0(z_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$\|z_n\| > C\|t_0(z_n)z_n\|_{2^*} \geq (C(1 - \frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu_n^{2^*-2})^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.3}$$

Combining (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$o_n(1) = \|v_n - z_n\| \geq \|z_n\| - \|v_n\| = C(1 - \frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_1} + o_n(1))^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} + o_n(1),$$

which is a contradiction for n large enough. Thus, for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, there exists $\mu^4_\lambda \leq \mu^3_\lambda$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}, \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}) := \inf\{\|v - z\| : v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}, z \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}\} > C(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} > 0$. We complete the proof of this lemma by taking $\mu^0_\lambda = \mu^4_\lambda$. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 3.2 *For every* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ *and* $\mu \in (0, \mu^0_\lambda)$, $\inf_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}} I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) > -\infty$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^0_\lambda)$, $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu} \neq \emptyset$. Let $v \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$, then, by the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) =& I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) - \frac{1}{2}I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v \\
=& -\frac{\lambda\mu}{2}\int_\Omega \varphi v dx - \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\mu\varphi\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |v + \mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(v + \mu\varphi)v dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\|v + \mu\varphi\|_{2^*}^{2^*} \\
\geq& (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^*})\|v + \mu\varphi\|_{2^*}^{2^*} - \frac{1}{2}\|v + \mu\varphi\|_{2^*}^{2^*-1}\|\mu\varphi\|_{2^*} - \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\mu\varphi\|_2^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\mu\varphi\|_2\|v\|_2 \\
\geq& C\|v\|_{2^*}^{2^*} - C(\lambda, \mu).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

This means that $\inf_{\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}} I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) > -C(\lambda, \mu)$. $\blacksquare$

By Lemma 3.2, we can define $m^\pm_{\lambda,\mu} = \inf_{\mathcal{N}^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}} I_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$ when $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^0_\lambda)$. Moreover, by (4) of Lemma 2.1, if $v^\pm_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}$ satisfy $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}) = m^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}$, then $v^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}$ are also local minimizers of $I_{\lambda,\mu}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$. Next lemma gives an estimate of $m^\pm_{\lambda,\mu}$.

Lemma 3.3 *For every* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, *there exists* $\mu^*_\lambda \in (0, \mu^0_\lambda]$ *such that*

$$m^+_{\lambda,\mu} \leq I_{\lambda,\mu}(0) < 0 < m^-_{\lambda,\mu} \quad \textit{for } \mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda).$$

Proof. We first estimate $m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. Indeed, $T_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(v)) = \min_{0 \leq t \leq t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)} T_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t) \leq T_{\lambda,\mu,v}(0)$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^0_\lambda)$ and $v \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$ by Lemma 3.1. So

$$m^+_{\lambda,\mu} \leq I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v) = T_{\lambda,\mu,v}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(v)) \leq T_{\lambda,\mu,v}(0) = I_{\lambda,\mu}(0) < 0.$$

Next, we estimate $m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. Assume $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, similar to (3.4), we have that

$$I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) \geq C\|v\|_{2^*}^{2^*} - C_1\mu^{2^*} - C_1\lambda\mu^2 - C_1(\lambda\mu)^{2^*/(2^*-1)}.$$

Since $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, similar to (3.3), we have $\|v\|_{2^*} \geq (C(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu^{2^*-2}))^{1/(2^*-2)}$. Thus, for every $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$, there exists $\mu^*_\lambda \in (0,\mu^0_\lambda]$ such that $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) \geq C(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})^{2^*/(2^*-2)} > 0$ for $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, which implies $m^-_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$. $\blacksquare$

Remark 3.1 *Combining Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3, we can conclude that for every $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^*_\lambda)$, $I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v) = \max_{t\geq 0} I_{\lambda,\mu}(tv)$ for every $v \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$.*

We close this section by establishing a local compactness lemma.

Lemma 3.4 *Assume $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) = c + o_n(1)$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) = o_n(1)$. If $c < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$, then there exists $v_0 \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \to v_0$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ up to a subsequence.*

Proof. Similar to (3.4), we know that $\{v_n\}$ is bounded in $L^{2^*}(\Omega)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) - \frac{1}{2^*}I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n \\
=&(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2^*})(\|v_n\|^2 - \lambda\|v_n\|_2^2) - (1-\frac{1}{2^*})\lambda\int_\Omega v_n\mu\varphi dx - \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\mu\varphi\|_2^2 \\
&-\frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |v_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(v_n+\mu\varphi)\mu\varphi dx \\
\geq&(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2^*})(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})\|v_n\|^2 - C\lambda\mu\|v_n\|_{2^*} - C\lambda\mu^2 - C\mu^{2^*} - C\mu\|v_n\|_{2^*}^{2^*-1},
\end{aligned}$$

$\{v_n\}$ is bounded in $H^1_0(\Omega)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $w_n = v_n - v_0$ then $w_n \rightharpoonup 0$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$. Note that, by the Brézis–Lieb Lemma and $v_n \to v_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\lambda,\mu}(w_n) =&\frac{1}{2}\|w_n\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\|w_n+\mu\varphi\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2^*}\|w_n+\mu\varphi\|_{2^*}^{2^*} \\
=&I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) - I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0) + I_{\lambda,\mu}(0) + o_n(1) \\
&-\frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega(|v_n-v_0+\mu\varphi|^2 + |v_0+\mu\varphi|^2 - |v_n+\mu\varphi|^2 - |\mu\varphi|^2)dx \\
&-\frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega(|v_n-v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} + |v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} - |v_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} - |\mu\varphi|^{2^*})dx \\
=&I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) - I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0) + I_{\lambda,\mu}(0) + o_n(1) \\
&-\frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega(|w_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} - |w_n|^{2^*} - |\mu\varphi|^{2^*})dx \\
&-\frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega(|v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} + |w_n|^{2^*} - |w_n+v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*})dx \\
=&I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) - I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0) + I_{\lambda,\mu}(0) + o_n(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

On the other hand, also by the Brézis–Lieb Lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&I'_{\lambda,\mu}(w_n)w_n \\
=&I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n - I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0)v_0 + o_n(1) - \int_\Omega(|w_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(w_n+\mu\varphi)w_n dx \\
&+\int_\Omega(|v_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(v_n+\mu\varphi)v_n - |v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(v_0+\mu\varphi)v_0)dx \\
=&I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n - I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0)v_0 - \int_\Omega(|v_n-v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} + |v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} - |v_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*} - |\mu\varphi|^{2^*})dx \\
&+o_n(1) + \int_\Omega(|w_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(w_n+\mu\varphi) - |\mu\varphi|^{2^*-1} - |v_n+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(v_n+\mu\varphi))\mu\varphi dx \\
&+\int_\Omega|v_0+\mu\varphi|^{2^*-2}(v_0+\mu\varphi)\mu\varphi dx \\
=&I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n - I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0)v_0 + o_n(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Since $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) = o_n(1)$, $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0) = 0$. This means that $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(w_n)w_n = o_n(1)$. Assume $\|w_n\|^2 = b+o_n(1)$. Then, by $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(w_n)w_n = o_n(1)$, we know that $\|w_n\|_{2^*}^{2^*} = b+o_n(1)$. This, together with the Brézis–Lieb Lemma, implies that

$$I_{\lambda,\mu}(w_n) = \frac{1}{N}b + o_n(1) + I_{\lambda,\mu}(0). \tag{3.7}$$

Note that $v_0 \neq 0$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0) = 0$ for $\mu > 0$. Therefore, $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0) \geq m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ by (3) of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3. Thus, combining (3.5) and (3.7), we conclude that $b < S^{N/2}$. On the other hand, if $b \neq 0$ then $b \geq S^{N/2}$, since

$$b^{2^*/2}S^{-2^*/2} + o_n(1) = \|w_n\|^{2^*}S^{-2^*/2} \geq \|w_n\|_{2^*}^{2^*} = b + o_n(1).$$

Therefore, we have $v_n \to v_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. ∎

4 Two solutions of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$

In this section, we will obtain two solutions of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ by using the method of fibering maps. We start by

Lemma 4.1 *For every $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^*_\lambda)$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ has a positive solution $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ with $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) = m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,\mu} = \emptyset$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^*_\lambda)$. Thus, using the Ekeland principle in a standard way (cf. Sun and Li [19]), we can obtain a sequence $\{v^n_{\lambda,\mu}\} \subset \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ satisfying $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^n_{\lambda,\mu}) \to m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v^n_{\lambda,\mu}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thanks to Lemma 3.4, there exists $v^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ such that $v^n_{\lambda,\mu} \to v^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$, which implies $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) = m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. Without loss of generality, we can choose $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} \geq 0$. Indeed, if $(v^+_{\lambda,\mu})_- := \min\{v^+_{\lambda,\mu}, 0\} \neq 0$, then $|\mu\varphi + v^+_{\lambda,\mu}| \leq \mu\varphi + |v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|$ since $\varphi \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) \\ =&\frac{1}{2}\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2^*}\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi\|_{2^*}^{2^*} \\ \geq&\frac{1}{2}\big\||v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|\big\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\big\||v^+_{\lambda,\mu}| + \mu\varphi\big\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2^*}\big\||v^+_{\lambda,\mu}| + \mu\varphi\big\|_{2^*}^{2^*} \\ =&I_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1, there exist $0 < t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) < t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) < +\infty$ such that $t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}| \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}| \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. There are two cases may occur:

(1) $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) < 1$;

(2) $1 \leq t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)$.

If case (1) holds, then $1 > t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) > t_0(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)$ since $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}| \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. It follows that

$$\big\||v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|\big\|_{2^*} > \big\|t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|\big\|_{2^*} > \big\|t_0(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|\big\|_{2^*}.$$

On the other hand, $1 < t_0(v^+_{\lambda,\mu})$ since $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. It follows that

$$\big\||v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|\big\|_{2^*} = \|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|_{2^*} < \|t_0(v^+_{\lambda,\mu})v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|_{2^*}.$$

Thus, $t_0(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) > t_0(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)$. Recall the choice of $t_0(v)$, we know that $t_0(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) = t_0(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, case (2) must happen. In this case, by (2) of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) = \min_{0 \leq t \leq t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)} I_{\lambda,\mu}(t|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) \leq I_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|).$$

This, together with (4.1), gives that

$$m^+_{\lambda,\mu} = I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) \geq I_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) \geq I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) \geq m^+_{\lambda,\mu},$$

that is, $I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) = m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. Thanks to (3) and (4) of Lemma 3.1, $t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|$ is also a local minimum of $I_{\lambda,\mu}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$. Similar to [8, Theorem 2.3], we can show that $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^+_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}|) = 0$. Therefore, by the maximum principle, there exists $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ such that $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) = m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) = 0$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$. ■

Lemma 4.2 *For every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(u)$ is continuous for $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu} = \{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} = 1\}$.*

Proof. Since $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(u)$ is unique for every $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(u)$ is continuous for $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$. Let $v = \frac{u}{\|u\|}$, then by Lemma 3.1, there exists $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v) > 0$ such that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, that is, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{u}{\|u\|} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. If $u \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, then by the uniqueness of $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(u)$, we must have $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} = 1$. Therefore, $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu} \subset \{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} = 1\}$. On the other hand, if $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} = 1$, then also by Lemma 3.1, $u = t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{u}{\|u\|} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, which implies that $\mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu} = \{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} = 1\}$. ■

Lemma 4.3 *For every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$, $m^-_{\lambda,\mu} < m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$.*

Proof. Let $w_{\lambda,\mu,t} = v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + tU_\lambda$, where U_λ is the ground state of $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,0})$. For the sake of clarity, we divide the proof into three steps.

Step. 1 For every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$, there exists $C_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ such that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t}) < C_{\lambda,\mu}$ for all $t \geq 0$, where $\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t} = \frac{w_{\lambda,\mu,t}}{\|w_{\lambda,\mu,t}\|}$.

Indeed, by Lemma 4.2, if not, then there exists $\{t_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $t_n \to +\infty$ such that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}) \to +\infty$. By the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem,

$$\int_\Omega |\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}|^{2^*} dx = \int_\Omega \frac{|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_n U_\lambda|^{2^*}}{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_n U_\lambda\|^{2^*}} dx = \frac{\|U_\lambda\|^{2^*}_{2^*}}{\|U_\lambda\|^{2^*}} + o_n(1).$$

This, together with Lemma 3.3 and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, implies

$$\begin{aligned}
0 <& I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n})\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}) \\
=& \frac{(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}))^2}{2}\|\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega (t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n})\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n} + \mu\varphi)^2 dx \\
&- \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega (t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n})\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n} + \mu\varphi)^{2^*} dx \\
=& \frac{(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}))^2}{2}(\|\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}\|^2 - \lambda\|\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}\|^2_2 + o_n(1)) - \frac{(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}))^{2^*}}{2^*}(\|\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}\|^{2^*}_{2^*} + o_n(1)) \\
\leq& \frac{(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}))^2}{2}(1 + o_n(1)) - \frac{(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{\lambda,\mu,t_n}))^{2^*}}{2^*}(\frac{\|U_\lambda\|^{2^*}_{2^*}}{\|U_\lambda\|^{2^*}} + o_n(1)) \to -\infty \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Step. 2 For every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$, there exists $t_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ such that $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}^-_{\lambda,\mu} := \{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} < 1\}$ and $\mathcal{A}^+_{\lambda,\mu} := \{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} > 1\} \cup \{0\}$. By Lemma 4.2, we know that $H^1_0(\Omega) = \mathcal{A}^-_{\lambda,\mu} \cup \mathcal{A}^+_{\lambda,\mu} \cup \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. By Lemma 3.1, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu} \subset \mathcal{A}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. In particular, $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{A}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. On the other hand, let $t^1_{\lambda,\mu} = \frac{C_{\lambda,\mu}+1+\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|}{\|U_\lambda\|}$, where $C_{\lambda,\mu}$ is given in Step. 1. Then by Step. 1,

$$\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t^1_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda\|^2 \geq (t^1_{\lambda,\mu}\|U_\lambda\| - \|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|)^2 = (C_{\lambda,\mu}+1)^2 > \left(t(\frac{v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t^1_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda}{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t^1_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda\|})^-\right)^2,$$

which implies that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{v^+_{\lambda,\mu}+t^1_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda}{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}+t^1_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda\|})\frac{1}{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}+t^1_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda\|} < 1$, that is, $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t^1_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda \in \mathcal{A}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. By the continuity of $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(u)$ for u, there exists $t_{\lambda,\mu} \in (0, t^1_{\lambda,\mu})$ such that $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda \in \{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\frac{u}{\|u\|})\frac{1}{\|u\|} = 1\}$. Thanks to Lemma 4.2, $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$.

Step. 3 $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda) < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$, where $t_{\lambda,\mu}$ is given in Step. 2.

Since $v^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$, by a direct calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda)\\
=&I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) + I_{\lambda,0}(t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda)\\
&-\frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega((v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda + \mu\varphi)^{2^*} - 2^*(v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi)^{2^*-1}t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda - (t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda)^{2^*} - (v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi)^{2^*})dx.
\end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that $I_{\lambda,0}(t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda) \leq I_{\lambda,0}(U_\lambda) < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$ (cf. Struwe [17]). On the other hand, $(a+b)^p - a^p - b^p - pa^{p-1}b \geq 0$ for all $a > 0$, $b > 0$ and $p > 1$. Therefore, $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu}U_\lambda) < m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$.

Combining Step. 2 and Step. 3, we know that $m^-_{\lambda,\mu} < m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$ for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$. ▮

Lemma 4.4 *For every* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ *and* $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ *has a positive solution* $v^-_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ *with* $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) = m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, $\mathcal{N}^0_{\lambda,\mu} = \emptyset$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$. Thus, using the Ekeland principle in a standard way (cf. Sun and Li [19]), we can obtain a sequence $\{v^n_{\lambda,\mu}\} \subset \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ satisfying $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^n_{\lambda,\mu}) \to m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v^n_{\lambda,\mu}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. By Lemma 4.3, $m^-_{\lambda,\mu} < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + m^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. Thus, by Lemma 3.4, there exists $v^-_{\lambda,\mu} \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that $v^n_{\lambda,\mu} \to v^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$. This implies $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) = m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) = 0$. Without loss of generality, we may choose $v^-_{\lambda,\mu} \geq 0$. Indeed, by Lemma 3.1, there exists $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|) > 0$ such that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}| \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. Thus, by Remark 3.1 and a similar argument of (4.1), we have that

$$m^-_{\lambda,\mu} = I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) \geq I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|)v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) \geq I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|) \geq m^-_{\lambda,\mu},$$

which implies $I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|) = m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. Similar to [8, Theorem 2.3], we can show that $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|) = 0$ since, by (4) of Lemma 3.1, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|)|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}|$ is a local minimum of $I_{\lambda,\mu}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}$. Therefore, by the maximum principle, there exists $v^-_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ such that $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) = m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) = 0$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$. ▮

Now, we can prove Theorem 1.1

Proof of Theorem 1.1 It follows immediately from Proposition 2.1, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.4. ▮

5 The third solution $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$

In this section, we will find the third solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ by using the theory of category as in Wu [21]. We first recall the definition of Lusternik–Schnirelman category and some useful lemmas.

Definition 5.1 *(i) For a topological space X, we say a non-empty, closed subset $Y \subset X$ is contractible to a point in X if and only if there exists a continuous mapping*

$$\xi : [0,1] \times Y \to X$$

such that for some $x_0 \in X$

$$\xi(0,x) = x \quad \text{for all } x \in Y,$$

and

$$\xi(1,x) = x_0 \quad \text{for all } x \in Y.$$

(ii) We define

$$\begin{aligned} cat(X) := \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} : & \text{ there exist closed subsets } Y_1, \cdots, Y_k \subset X \\ & \text{ such that } Y_j \text{ is contractible to a point in } X \text{ for all} \\ & j \text{ and } \cup_{j=1}^{k} Y_j = X\}. \end{aligned}$$

When there do not exist finitely many closed subsets $Y_1, \cdots, Y_k \subset X$ such that Y_j is contractible to a point in X for all j and $\cup_{j=1}^{k} Y_j = X$, we say $cat(X) = \infty$.

We also need the following three lemmas.

Lemma 5.1 *[1, Theorem 2.3] Suppose that X is a Hilbert manifold and $F \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$. Assume that there are $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

(i) $F(x)$ satisfies the Palais–Smale condition for energy level $c \leq c_0$,

(ii) $cat(\{x \in X : F(x) \leq c_0\}) \geq k$.

Then $F(x)$ has at least k critical points in $\{x \in X : F(x) \leq c_0\}$.

Lemma 5.2 *[3, Lemma 2.5] Let X be a topological space. Suppose that there are two continuous maps*

$$\Phi : \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \to X, \quad \Psi : X \to \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$$

such that $\Psi \circ \Phi$ is homotopic to the identity map of $\mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, that is there exists a continuous map $\zeta : [0,1] \times \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \to \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\zeta(0,x) = \Psi \circ \Phi(x) \quad \text{for each } x \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}, \\ &\zeta(1,x) = x \quad \text{for each } x \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $cat(X) \geq 2$.

Lemma 5.3 *[21, Lemma 4.4] Assume Ω satisfies condition (D), then there exists $d_0 > 0$ such that for $v \in \mathcal{N}_{0,0}$ with $I_{0,0}(v) \leq \frac{1}{N} S^{N/2} + d_0$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{x}{|x|} |\nabla v|^2 dx \neq 0.$$

The following lemmas are crucial in finding the third solution.

Lemma 5.4 *There exist $\lambda^* \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu^{**} \in (0, \mu_\lambda^*)$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**})$ and $v \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda,\mu}^-$ with $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) < m_{\lambda,\mu}^+ + \frac{1}{N} S^{N/2}$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{x}{|x|} |\nabla v|^2 dx \neq 0.$$

Proof. Assume $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) < m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$. Similar to (3.4), for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} > I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) - \frac{1}{2^*}I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v \geq C\|v\|^{2^*}_{2^*} - C_1\mu^{2^*} - C_1\lambda\mu^2 - C_1(\lambda\mu)^{2^*/(2^*-1)}, \tag{5.1}$$

since, by Lemma 3.3, $m^+_{\lambda,\mu} < 0$. It is well-known that there exists $t_v > 0$ such that $t_v v \in \mathcal{N}_{0,0}$. Moreover, by Remark 3.1, $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) \geq I_{\lambda,\mu}(t_v v)$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$. Since $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, similar to (3.3), we have $\|v\|_{2^*} \geq (C(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu^{2^*-2})^{1/(2^*-2)} > 0$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$. Thus, there exist $\lambda^0 \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu^* > 0$ such that $\|v\|_{2^*} \geq C > 0$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^0)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$. This implies that there exists $T > 0$ such that $t_v \leq T$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^0)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$ and $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. On the other hand, since $t_v v \in \mathcal{N}_{0,0}$, $\|t_v v\|_{2^*} \geq C > 0$. This, together with (5.1), implies that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $t_0 \leq t_v$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^0)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$ and $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. Therefore, by the mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{0,0}(t_v v) =& I_{\lambda,\mu}(t_v v) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|t_v v + \mu\varphi\|^2_2 + \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega (|t_v v + \mu\varphi|^{2^*} - |t_v v|^{2^*})dx \\ \leq& I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) + C(\lambda, \mu) \\ \leq& \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + C(\lambda, \mu), \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\lambda, \mu) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$ and $\mu \to 0$. Thus, there exist $\lambda^* \in (0, \lambda^0]$ and $\mu^{**} \in (0, \mu^*]$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**})$ and $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ with $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) < m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$, we have

$$I_{0,0}(t_v v) \leq \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + d_0.$$

By Lemma 5.3,

$$t_v^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{x}{|x|}|\nabla v|^2 dx \neq 0.$$

Since $t_v \geq t_0$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**})$ and $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{x}{|x|}|\nabla v|^2 dx \neq 0$$

for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**})$ and $v \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ with $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v) < m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$. ∎

Let

$$U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}(x) = \frac{\phi(x)(N(N-2)\varepsilon)^{(N-2)/2}}{(\varepsilon^2 + |x - (1-\varepsilon)\overrightarrow{y}|)^{(N-2)/2}},$$

where $\phi(x) \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ is radially symmetric function such that $0 \leq \phi(x) \leq 1$ and $\phi(x) \equiv 1$ for $2\delta_0 \leq |x| \leq \frac{1}{2\delta_0}$, δ_0 is given in (D), $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| = 1\}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small enough. Then we have

Lemma 5.5 *There exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $\lambda^1_{**} \leq \lambda^*$ and $\mu^1_{**} \leq \mu^{**}$ such that for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^1_{**})$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^1_{**})$, $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}(x) \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ for all $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$ and some $t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} > 0$. Moreover, there exist $t^*_{\lambda,\mu} > t'_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$, independent of ε, such that $t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} \in (t'_{\lambda,\mu}, t^*_{\lambda,\mu})$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proofs of Step. 1 and Step. 2 in Lemma 4.3, so we only sketch it. By [16, Lemma 4.2], there exist $t^{**}_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for $t \geq t^{**}_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$, we have

$$\frac{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + tU_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^{2^*}_{2^*}}{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + tU_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^{2^*}} \geq \frac{2^*\|U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^{2^*}_{2^*}}{\|U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^{2^*} - \frac{2^*}{t^{2^*}}\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|^{2^*}} = \frac{S^{N/2} + o(\varepsilon)}{(S^{N/2})^{2^*/2} + o(\varepsilon) - \frac{2^*}{t^{2^*}}\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|^{2^*}} \geq C > 0.$$

Hence, as in Step. 1 of Lemma 4.3, we can obtain $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{t,\varepsilon}) \le T$ for some $T > 0$ if $t \ge t^{**}_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$, where

$$\widetilde{w}_{t,\varepsilon} = \frac{v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + tU_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}}{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + tU_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|}.$$

Let $t^*_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} = \max\{t^{**}_{\lambda,\mu}, \frac{T+1+\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu}\|}{\|U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|}\}$, then also by [16, Lemma 4.2], there exists $t^*_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ such that $t^*_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} \le t^*_{\lambda,\mu}$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$. Similar to Step. 2 of Lemma 4.3, we have

$$t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{w}_{t^*_{\lambda,\mu},\varepsilon}) \frac{1}{\|v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t^*_{\lambda,\mu}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|} < 1.$$

Thus, as in Step. 2 of Lemma 4.3, there exists $t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} \le t^*_{\lambda,\mu}$ such that $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ for every $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$. Moreover, since $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\|U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^{2^*}_{2^*} = S^{N/2} + O(\varepsilon^N)$ (cf. He and Yang [16], Sun and Li [19], Wu [21]), by a similar argument of (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} \ge \frac{(C(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu^{2^*-2})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-2}} - C_1\mu^{2^*} - C_1(\lambda\mu)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-1}}}{S^{N/2} + O(\varepsilon^N)}$$

Therefore, there exist $\varepsilon_0 \le \varepsilon_1$, $\lambda^1_{**} \le \lambda^*$ and $\mu^1_{**} \le \mu^{**}$ such that $t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} > t'_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^1_{**})$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^1_{**})$. ■

Lemma 5.6 *Assume* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^1_{**})$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^1_{**})$ *and* $N \ge 4$. *Then there exists* $\varepsilon^* \le \varepsilon_0$ *such that for* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$, $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\lambda,\mu,\sigma_\varepsilon}$ *for all* $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$, *where* $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda,\mu,\sigma_\varepsilon} := \{u \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu} : u \ge 0, I_{\lambda,\mu}(u) < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + m^+_{\lambda,\mu} - \sigma_\varepsilon\}$ *and* $\sigma_\varepsilon \to 0$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Proof. Similar to Step. 3 in Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}) =& I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}) + I_{\lambda,0}(t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}) - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}|^{2^*}dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}|^{2^*}dx + \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi|^{2^*}dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega (v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi)^{2^*-1}t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon} \in (t'_{\lambda,\mu}, t^*_{\lambda,\mu})$, by a famous estimate (cf. Sun and Li [19]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}) \le& m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{t^2_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}}{2}(\|U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2 - \lambda\|U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2_2) - \frac{t^{2^*}_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}}{2^*}\|U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^{2^*}_{2^*} \\ &- (t'_{\lambda,\mu})^{2^*-1}\int_\Omega (U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}})^{2^*-1}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \mu\varphi)dx + o(\varepsilon^{(N-2)/2}) \\ \le& m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} - \varepsilon^{(N-2)/2}(D - o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$D = (t'_{\lambda,\mu})^{2^*-1}(v^+_{\lambda,\mu}(\overrightarrow{y}) + \mu\varphi(\overrightarrow{y}))\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(N(N-2))^{\frac{N+2}{2}}}{(1+|x|^2)^{(N+2)/2}}dx \quad \text{for } N \ge 4.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 5.5, there exists $\varepsilon^* \le \varepsilon_0$ such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$, $v^+_{\lambda,\mu} + t_{\lambda,\mu,\varepsilon}U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\lambda,\mu,\sigma_\varepsilon}$ for all $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$, where $\sigma_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{(N-2)/2}(D - o(1)) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. ■

Now, we can obtain the third solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$.

Lemma 5.7 *Assume* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^1_{**})$ *and* $\mu \in (0, \mu^1_{**})$. *Then* $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ *has three solutions.*

Proof. Since Lemmas 5.4–5.6 holds for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^1_{**})$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^1_{**})$, we can follow the proof of [21, Lemma 5.6] step by step to show that $\mathrm{Cat}(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda,\mu}) \geq 2$ by using Lemma 5.2. Thanks to Lemma 5.1, there exist two solutions of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda,\mu}$. This, together with Lemmas 3.3, 4.1 and 4.4, implies that $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ has three solutions for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^1_{**})$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^1_{**})$. ▮

6 The fourth solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$

In this section, we will follow the strategy of He and Yang [16] to discuss the existence of the fourth solution for $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$. We begin with

Lemma 6.1 *For every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, there exist $\mu^{**}_\lambda \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$ and $r_\lambda > 0$ such that*

(1) *$I_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$ is strictly convex in $B(0, r_\lambda)$, where $B(0, r) := \{u \in H^1_0(\Omega) : \|u\| < r\}$.*

(2) *$\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu} \subset B(0, r_\lambda)$ for $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**}_\lambda)$.*

(3) *$v^+_{\lambda,\mu}$ is the unique critical point of $I_{\lambda,\mu}$ in $\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$.*

Proof. (1) By a direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I''_{\lambda,\mu}(u)(v,v) =& \|v\|^2 - \lambda\|v\|_2^2 - (2^* - 1)\int_\Omega |u + \mu\varphi|^{2^*-2} v^2 dx \\
\geq& (1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})S\|v\|^2_{2^*} - (2^* - 1)2^{2^*-2}(S^{\frac{2^*-2}{2}}\|u\|^{2^*-2} + C\mu^{2^*-2})\|v\|^2_{2^*} \\
=& \big((1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})S - (2^* - 1)2^{2^*-2}(S^{\frac{2^*-2}{2}}\|u\|^{2^*-2} + C\mu^{2^*-2})\big)\|v\|^2_{2^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, there exists $\mu^{00}_\lambda \in (0, \mu^*_\lambda)$ such that

$$(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})S - (2^* - 1)2^{2^*-2}C\mu^{2^*-2} > \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})S \quad \text{for } \mu \in (0, \mu^{00}_\lambda).$$

Take

$$r_\lambda = \Big(\frac{\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1})S}{(2^* - 1)2^{2^*-2}S^{\frac{2^*-2}{2}}}\Big)^{1/(2^*-2)},$$

then $I''_{\lambda,\mu}(u)(v, v) > 0$ for $u \in B(0, r_\lambda)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^{00}_\lambda)$ and $v \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$.

(2) Similar to (3.2), we can show that $\|v\| \leq C\big((\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1-\lambda})((\lambda\mu_n)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-1}} + \mu_n^{2^*})\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. It follows that there exists $\mu^{**}_\lambda \in (0, \mu^{00}_\lambda)$ such that $\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu} \subset B(0, r_\lambda)$ for $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**}_\lambda)$.

(3) Assume a contradiction, then there exist at least two critical points, denoted by $v^1_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $v^2_{\lambda,\mu}$, lie in $\mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$. By (1), we know that $I''_{\lambda,\mu}(tv^1_{\lambda,\mu} + (1 - t)v^2_{\lambda,\mu})(w, w) > 0$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**}_\lambda)$, $w \in H^1_0(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. This, together with the Taylor's expansion, implies both $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^1_{\lambda,\mu}) > I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^2_{\lambda,\mu})$ and $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^2_{\lambda,\mu}) > I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^1_{\lambda,\mu})$, which is a contradiction. ▮

The following lemma is a further local compactness lemma.

Lemma 6.2 *Assume $v_n \geq 0$, $v_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) = c + o_n(1)$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) = o_n(1)$. If $c \in (m^+_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}, m^-_{\lambda,\mu} + \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2})$, then there exists $v_0 \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ such that $v_n \to v_0$ as $n \to \infty$ up to a subsequence for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu^{**}_\lambda)$.*

Proof. As in Lemma 3.4, we can show that there exists $v_0 \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$. Let $w_n = v_n - v_0$. Then by (3.5) and the Brézis–Lieb Lemma, we have

$$I_{0,0}(w_n) = I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) - I_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0) + o_n(1).$$

Similar to (3.6), we can obtain that

$$I'_{0,0}(w_n)\psi = I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)\psi - I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_0)\psi + o_n(1) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in H^1_0(\Omega).$$

Clearly, v_0 is a critical point of $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$. Hence, by a result of Struwe [17], there exist $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and a solution v^* of $(\mathcal{Q}_{0,0})$ such that $I_{0,0}(w_n) = I_{0,0}(v^*) + \frac{l}{N}S^{N/2} + o_n(1)$. If $v_0 \in \mathcal{N}^+_{\lambda,\mu}$, then by Lemmas 3.3, 4.3 and 6.1, we know that $v^* \neq 0$ and $l = 0$, since it is well-known that $v^* \neq 0$ implies $I_{0,0}(v^*) \geq \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$. Using Struwe's result again, we known that $v_n \to v_0 + v^*$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$, which is impossible since $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$. Therefore, we must have $v_0 \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. This implies $I_{0,0}(w_n) < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + o_n(1)$. Since $I_{0,0}(v^*) \geq \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$ if $v^* \neq 0$, we must have $v^* = 0$ and $l = 0$. Due to Struwe's result again, we know that $v_n \to v_0$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$. ▮

In what follows, we re-denote $U_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}(x)$ and $\phi(x)$ by $U^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}(x)$ and $\phi_{\delta_0}(x)$ for the sake of clarity. Similar to [16], we denote $\mathcal{V} := \{v \in H^1_0(\Omega) : v \geq 0, \|v\|_{2^*} = 1\}$. We define a functional $\beta : \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ given by $\beta(v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x|v|^{2^*}dx$, where the function v is extend to $\mathbb{R}^N$ by setting $v = 0$ outside Ω. Set $\mathcal{A}_0 := \{v \in \mathcal{V} : \beta(v) = 0\}$ and $c_* = \inf_{v\in\mathcal{A}_0}\|v\|^2$, then by [16, Lemma 5.4], $c_* > S$. Thanks to [16, Lemma 5.6], there exists $\varepsilon^{**} \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$ such that $\|U^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}(x)\|^2_{D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \in (S, \frac{S+c_*}{2})$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^{**})$. Let $\overline{r}_* = 1 - \varepsilon^{**}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\overline{r}_*} := \{(1-\varepsilon)\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N : |(1-\varepsilon)\overrightarrow{y}| \leq \overline{r}_*, \overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}, 0 < \varepsilon < 1\}$. We also define a functional $J_{\lambda,\mu} : \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $J_{\lambda,\mu}(v) = I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v)$, where $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$ is given in Lemma 3.1. Set

$$\gamma_{\lambda,\mu} = \inf_{\mathcal{F}} \sup_{\mathcal{B}_{\overline{r}_*}} J_{\lambda,\mu}(v),$$

where $\mathcal{F} := \{h \in C(\mathcal{B}_{\overline{r}_*}, \mathcal{V}) : h|_{\partial\mathcal{B}_{\overline{r}_*}} = \widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}(x)\}$ and $\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} = \frac{U^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}}{\|U^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|_{2^*}}$. The next three lemmas will help us to show that $\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a critical value of $J_{\lambda,\mu}$ on $\mathcal{V}$.

Lemma 6.3 *$J_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}) = \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu)$ for every $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$, $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and uniformly for $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$, where $O(\varepsilon) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $O(\mu) \to 0$ as $\mu \to 0$.*

Proof. By [16, Lemma 4.2], $\|U^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2 = S^{N/2} + o(\varepsilon)$, $\|U^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^{2^*}_{2^*} = S^{N/2} + o(\varepsilon)$ and $U^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} \rightharpoonup 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ for every $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ and uniformly for $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$. These, together with $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}})\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$, implies

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}})\|\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2 - \lambda t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}})\|\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2_2 - \lambda\mu\int_\Omega \varphi\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}dx \\
&- \int_\Omega (t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}})\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}} + \mu\varphi)^{2^*-1}\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}dx \\
=& t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}})(\|\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2 - \lambda\|\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2_2 - (t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}))^{2^*-2}) + O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (3.3), for every $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ and $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}) \geq (C + O(\varepsilon))(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1} + O(\mu))^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}$. Hence, we must have

$$\|\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2 - \lambda\|\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}\|^2_2 - (t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}))^{2^*-2} = O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu),$$

which means that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}) = S^{1/(2^*-2)} + O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}}) =& \frac{1}{2}(S^{(N-2)/2} + O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu))(\frac{S^{N/2} + o(\varepsilon)}{S^{(N-2)/2} + o(\varepsilon)}) - \frac{\lambda(O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu))}{2(S^{(N-2)/2} + o(\varepsilon))} \\
&- \frac{1}{2^*}(S^{N/2} + O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu)) \\
=& \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + O(\varepsilon) + O(\mu)
\end{aligned}$$

for every $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$, $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_1)$ and uniformly for $\overrightarrow{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{N-1}$. ▮

Lemma 6.4 *$m^-_{\lambda,\mu} = \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + O(\lambda) + O(\mu)$, where $O(\lambda) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$ and $O(\mu) \to 0$ as $\mu \to 0$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 3.3 and 4.3, it is easy to see that $m^-_{\lambda,\mu} < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}$. Since $v^-_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$, similar to (3.2) and (3.4), we can conclude that

$$(C(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu^{2^*-2}))^{1/(2^*-2)} \le \|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}\|_{2^*} \le C + C(\lambda,\mu),$$

where $C(\lambda,\mu) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$ and $\mu \to 0$. It is well-known that there exists $t^0_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ such that $t^0_{\lambda,\mu}v^-_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}_{0,0}$. Since $(C(1-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}) - C_1\mu^{2^*-2}))^{1/(2^*-2)} \le \|v^-_{\lambda,\mu}\|_{2^*}$, there exists $T > 0$ such that $t^0_{\lambda,\mu} \le T$ for λ and μ small enough. It follows from Remark 3.1 that

$$m^-_{\lambda,\mu} = I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) \ge I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^0_{\lambda,\mu}v^-_{\lambda,\mu}) \ge \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + O(\lambda) + O(\mu),$$

which completes the proof of this lemma. ▮

Lemma 6.5 *There exist $\rho > 0$, $\delta_* \in (0,1)$, $\lambda^2_{**} \in (0,\lambda^1_{**})$ and $\mu^2_{**} \in (0,\mu^1_{**})$ such that $\frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} < \gamma_{0,0} - \rho < \gamma_{\lambda,\mu} < \gamma_{0,0} + \rho < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_*)$, $\mu \in (0,\mu_*)$ and $\delta_0 \in (0,\delta_*)$.*

Proof. Similar to [16, Lemma 5.10], we can prove that there exists $\delta_* \in (0,1)$ such that $\gamma_{0,0} \in (\frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}, \frac{2}{N}S^{N/2})$ for $\delta_0 \in (0,\delta_*)$. It follows that there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} < \gamma_{0,0} - \rho < \gamma_{0,0} + \rho < \frac{2}{N}S^{N/2}$. Thanks to Lemma 6.4, there exist $\lambda^1 \in (0,\lambda^1_{**})$ and $\mu^1 \in (0,\mu^1_{**})$ such that $\gamma_0 + \rho < \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + m^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^1)$ and $\mu \in (0,\mu^1)$. On the other hand, for every $d \in (0,1)$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$, by the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}J_{\lambda,\mu}(v) = I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v) \le& I_{0,0}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v) + d\|t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v\|^{2^*}_{2^*} + C(\lambda,\mu,d)\\ \le& I_{0,0}(t^+_d(v)v) + d\|t^+_d(v)v\|^{2^*}_{2^*} + C(\lambda,\mu,d)\\ =&(\frac{1}{1-d})^{\frac{N-2}{2}}\|v\|^2 + C(\lambda,\mu,d)\\ =&(\frac{1}{1-d})^{\frac{N-2}{2}}J_{0,0}(v) + C(\lambda,\mu,d),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}J_{\lambda,\mu}(v) = I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v)v) \ge& I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_d(v)v)\\ \ge& I_{0,0}(t^-_d(v)v) - d\|t^-_d(v)v\|^{2^*}_{2^*} - C(\lambda,\mu,d)\\ =&(\frac{1}{1+d})^{\frac{N-2}{2}}\|v\|^2 - C(\lambda,\mu,d)\\ =&(\frac{1}{1+d})^{\frac{N-2}{2}}J_{0,0}(v) - C(\lambda,\mu,d),\end{aligned}$$

where $C(\lambda,\mu,d) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$ and $\mu \to 0$ for fixed $d \in (0,1)$, $I_{0,0}(t^+_d(v)v) + d\|t^+_d(v)v\|^{2^*}_{2^*} = \max_{t\ge0}(I_{0,0}(tv) + d\|tv\|^{2^*}_{2^*})$ and $I_{0,0}(t^-_d(v)v) - d\|t^-_d(v)v\|^{2^*}_{2^*} = \max_{t\ge0}(I_{0,0}(tv) - d\|tv\|^{2^*}_{2^*})$. By the definition of $\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}$, we have $(\frac{1}{1+d})^{\frac{N-2}{2}}\gamma_{0,0} - C(\lambda,\mu,d) \le \gamma_{\lambda,\mu} \le (\frac{1}{1-d})^{\frac{N-2}{2}}\gamma_{0,0} + C(\lambda,\mu,d)$. It follows that there exist $\lambda^2_{**} \in (0,\lambda^1)$ and $\mu^2_{**} \in (0,\mu^1)$ such that $\gamma_0 - \rho < \gamma_{\lambda,\mu} < \gamma_0 + \rho$, which completes the proof of this lemma. ▮

Combining Lemmas 6.3 and 6.5, there exist $\lambda_* \in (0,\lambda^2_{**})$ and $\mu_* \in (0,\mu^2_{**})$ such that $\gamma_{\lambda,\mu} > J_{\lambda,\mu}(\widetilde{U}^{\delta_0}_{\varepsilon,\overrightarrow{y}})$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_*)$, $\mu \in (0,\mu_*)$ and ε small enough. By the minimax principle (see Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz [4]), $\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a critical value of $J_{\lambda,\mu}(v)$ on $\mathcal{V}$, that is, there exists $\{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{V}$ such that

$$J_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) = \gamma_{\lambda,\mu} + o_n(1), \quad \|J'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)\|_{T^*_{v_n}\mathcal{V}} = o_n(1),$$

where $T^*_{v_n}\mathcal{V}$ is the dual space of $T_{v_n}\mathcal{V} := \{w \in H^1_0(\Omega) : \int_\Omega (v_n)^{2^*-1}w = 0\}$. In what follows, we will show the existence of the fourth solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$.

Lemma 6.6 *There exists* $v^4_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ *such that* $I_{\lambda,\mu}(v^4_{\lambda,\mu}) = \gamma_{\lambda,\mu}$ *and* $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(v^4_{\lambda,\mu}) = 0$ *for* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ *and* $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$.

Proof. By the implicit function theorem, for $h \in T_{v_n}\mathcal{V}$, we have

$$J'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)h = ((t^-_{\lambda,\mu})'(v_n)h)I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)v_n + t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)h.$$

By Lemma 3.1, for every v_n, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) > 0$. This implies $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)v_n = 0$, since $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$. It follows that

$$J'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)h = t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)h \quad \text{for } h \in T_{v_n}\mathcal{V}. \tag{6.1}$$

We claim that $\{t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ stays positive and bounded away from 0. If not, then $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) \to 0$ up to a subsequence as $n \to \infty$. It follows that $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)(\|v_n\|^2 - \lambda\|v_n\|^2_2) = \lambda\mu \int_\Omega \varphi v_n dx + \int_\Omega (\mu\varphi)^{2^*-1}v_n + o_n(1)$, since $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $v_n \in \mathcal{V}$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{N}S^{N/2} + o_n(1) \leq \gamma_{\lambda,\mu} + o_n(1) = J_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n) \leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\|\mu\varphi\|^2_2 + o_n(1) < o_n(1),$$

a contradiction. Note that $H^1_0(\Omega) = \mathbb{R}v_n \oplus T_{v_n}\mathcal{V}$ and $I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)v_n = 0$,

$$I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)w = I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)h_w \quad \text{for all } w \in H^1_0(\Omega),$$

where h_w is the projection of w in $T_{v_n}\mathcal{V}$. Thus, by (6.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)\| &= \sup_{w\in H^1_0(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)w}{\|w\|} \\
&\leq \sup_{w\in H^1_0(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{I'_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n)h_w}{\|h_w\|} \\
&= \sup_{w\in H^1_0(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{J'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)h_w}{t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)h_w} \\
&\leq C\|J'_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)\|_{T^*_{v_n}\mathcal{V}} = o_n(1).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the definition of $J_{\lambda,\mu}$, it is easy to see that $I_{\lambda,\mu}(t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n) \to \gamma_{\lambda,\mu}$ as $n \to \infty$. Thanks to Lemmas 6.2 and 6.5, $t^-_{\lambda,\mu}(v_n)v_n \to v^4_{\lambda,\mu}$ as $n \to \infty$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$ and $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta_*)$. Clearly, $v^4_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a solution of $(\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,\mu})$ and different from the solutions find in Lemmas 4.1, 4.4 and 5.7 for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$ and $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta_*)$. ▌

We close this section by

Proof of Theorem 1.2 It follows immediately from Lemmas 5.7 and 6.6. ▌

7 Acknowledgements

Y. Wu is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (2014QNA67).

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, Critical points and nonlinear variational problems, Bulletin Soc. Math. France, Mémoire, N.49, 1992.

[2] G. Arioli, F. Gazzola, H. Grunau and E. Sassone, The second bifurcation branch for radial solutions of the Brezis–Nirenberg problem in dimension four. NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **15** (2008) 69–90.

[3] S. Adachi and K. Tanaka, Four positive solutions for the semilinear elliptic equation: $-\Delta u + u = a(x)u^p + f(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **11** (2000) 63–95.

[4] A. Ambrosetti and P. Rabinowitz, Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications, J. Funct. Anal. **14** (1973) 349–381.

[5] P. Bolle, N. Ghoussoub and H. Tehrani, The multiplicity of solutions in non–homogeneous boundary value problems, Manuscripta Math. **101** (2000) 325–350.

[6] H. Brézis and L. Nirenberg, Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36** (1983) 437–477.

[7] K. Brown and T. Wu, A fibering map approach to a potential operator equation and its applications, Differential Integral Equations **22** (2009) 1097–1114.

[8] K. Brown and Y. Zhang, The Nehari manifold for a semilinear elliptic equation with a sign-changing weight function, J. Differential Equations **193** (2003) 481–499.

[9] A. Cañada, P. Drábek and J. Gãmez, Existence of positive solutions for some problems with nonlinear diffusion, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **349** (1997) 4231–4249.

[10] A. Candela, A. Salvatore and M. Squassina, Multiple solutions for semilinear elliptic systems with non–homogeneous boundary conditions. Nonlinear Anal. TMA **51** (2002) 249–270.

[11] Z. Chen, N. Shioji and W. Zou, Ground state and multiple solutions for a critical exponent problem, Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. **19** (2012) 253–277.

[12] M. Clapp and T. Weth, Multiple solutions for the Brezis–Nirenberg problem. Adv. Differ. Equ. **10** (2005) 463–480.

[13] P. Drábek and S. Pohozaev, Positive solutions for the p–Laplacian: application of the fibering method, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **127** (1997) 703–726.

[14] D. Gilbarg and S. Trudinger, Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order, 2nd Edition, Springer, Berlin, 1998.

[15] Y. Hu, Multiplicity of solutions for some semi–linear elliptic systems with non-homogeneous boundary conditions. Appl. Anal. **83** (2004) 77–96.

[16] H. He and J. Yang, Positive solutions for critical inhomogeneous elliptic problems in non–contractible domains, Nonlinear Anal. TMA **70** (2009) 952–973.

[17] M. Struwe, Variational Methods: Applications to Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Hamiltonian Systems, Third ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000.

[18] A. Salvatore, Multiple solutions for some elliptic equations with non–homogeneous boundary conditions. Nonlinear Anal. TMA **47** (2001) 1593–1604.

[19] Y. Sun and S. Li, A nonlinear elliptic equation with critical exponent: Estimates for extremal values, Nonlinear Anal. TMA **69** (2008) 1856–1869.

[20] M. Schechter and W. Zou, On the Brézis–Nirenberg problem. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **197** (2010) 337–356.

[21] T. Wu, Three positive solutions for Dirichlet problems involving critical Sobolev exponent and sign-changing weight, J. Differential Equations **249** (2010) 1549–1578.

[22] D. Zhang, On multiple solutions of $-\Delta u + u + |u|^{\frac{4}{N-2}} = 0$, Nonlinear Anal. TMA **13** (1989) 353–372.